



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,540	07/08/2003	Christopher C. Langenfeld	2229/146	8265
2101	7590	11/07/2005	EXAMINER	
BROMBERG & SUNSTEIN LLP			COMPTON, ERIC B	
125 SUMMER STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOSTON, MA 02110-1618			3726	

DATE MAILED: 11/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/615,540	LANGENFELD ET AL.
	Examiner Eric B. Compton	Art Unit 3726
<i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>		
Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.		
<p>- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</p> <p>- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</p> <p>- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>		
Status		
<p>1)<input type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.</p> <p>2a)<input type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL. 2b)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.</p> <p>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.</p>		
Disposition of Claims		
<p>4)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.</p> <p>4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.</p> <p>6)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.</p> <p>7)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.</p> <p>8)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</p>		
Application Papers		
<p>9)<input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p>10)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 July 2003</u> is/are: a)<input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).</p> <p>11)<input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.</p>		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
<p>12)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</p> <p>a)<input type="checkbox"/> All b)<input type="checkbox"/> Some * c)<input type="checkbox"/> None of:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">1.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">2.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">3.<input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</p>		
<p>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</p>		
Attachment(s)		
<p>1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/8/03</u></p> <p>4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</p> <p>6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>		

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art—or –Related Art— because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. 1,769,375 to Leary in view of U.S. Pat. 5,431,498 to Lyon.

Leary discloses a reduced weight guide link, i.e., a yoke (14) for an engine. The reference discloses that roller (31) of the link (14) is adapted to bear against a side surface (32) of the guide link. Furthermore, the reference recognizes that the side surface (32) is subject to wear. See Page 2, Col. 1, lines 31-36.

However, the reference does not discloses providing a guideway insert, such that the wear resistance of the insert is greater than the wear resistance of the guide link.

Note: the guideway insert is a bearing surface.

Lyon discloses providing a linear motion bearing, in which a bearing insert (54) is mounted onto the rail assembly. The reference notes that using insert minimizes the use of bearing element materials, and processing steps, thus reducing costs. See Col. 2, lines 40-55; See also U.S. Pat. 4,635,331.

Regarding claims 1 and 13, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have formed the guide link of Leary by providing a guideway insert, in light of the teachings of Lyon, in order to minimize bearing materials, and processing steps, thus reducing costs.

Regarding claims 12 and 24, as shown in Figure 3, end plates (26) may be used to keep the inserts (26) positioned in the assembly.

Regarding claims 5-7 and 17-19, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have formed the insert of Leary/Lyon having a suitable shaped cross-sectional, since it is merely a matter of design choice, absent any new or unexpected results, and the bearing surface will function identically as such.

Regarding claims 2-4, 8-11, 14-16, and, 20-23, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have formed the insert of Leary/Lyon from a suitable bearing material, in order to provide a suitable wear-resistant surface. The selection of a known material based on its suitability for its

intended use supported a *prima facie* obviousness determination in *Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp.*, 325 U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945); see Lyon, Col. 4, line 8 (disclosing the insert material may be high quality bearing); see also U.S. Pat. 6,293,764, Col. 3, lines 24-26 (disclosing bearing insert may be provided with hard layer coating of material, e.g., titanium nitride or diamond-like carbon.)

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric B. Compton whose telephone number is (571) 272-4527. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bryant can be reached on (571) 272-4526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ebc



**ERIC COMPTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER**